REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-3 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of August 7, 2007, wherein it was noted that the application claims priority as a continuation of prior Application No. 09/565,927 filed May 5, 2000.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claim 4

Claim 4 stands objected to because of various informalities. Claim 4 has been amended to correct any deficiencies related to this objection, as such the objection is moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-5 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendrickson *et al.* (US 5,933,646) in view of Cheng, Jr. *et al.* (US Patent Pub. 2003/0110241). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Hendrickson *et al.* and Cheng, Jr. *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must show an unrebutted *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicants' disclosure. *See In re Vaeck,* 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a new UI presentation and additional available custom actions for an installation application. The UI presentation and concepts behind the custom install actions ask a component to provide a list of the install actions that it can support. Further, the default actions (install, uninstall, and no action) must be supported. The UI presents this list to an end-user in a listbox that is displayed for each component upon selection of a drop-down arrow, allowing the user to select whichever install action works best for her. Once the user has selected the desired installation scenario, a component selection screen is displayed to the user. The screen displays the components of the suite and the available install actions that may be performed.

More particularly, independent claims 1 and 5 recite similar limitations, namely: a method in a computer system for displaying on a display device a component install action selection screen for an installation application, the installation application adapted to perform install actions for a plurality of constituent components of an application program suite, comprising the steps of: *displaying a first list of the plurality of constituent components; obtaining a second list of available install actions for each of the plurality of constituent components; displaying one of the available install actions in proximity to each of the plurality of constituent components of the first list;* ***displaying version information and disk space requirements for each of the plurality of constituent components; and displaying a coloring difference between a plurality of constituent components that are in the process of installing or are already installed versus a plurality of constituent components that are set to install but are not installed.*** The cited art, individually or in combination, fails to teach or suggest such aspects of the claimed subject matter.

Hendrickson *et al.* discloses a software manager which enables a computer user to easily administer software components within a computer operating system. The software manager consists of a configuration database, a user interface, and a software manager server. The configuration database stores information which includes a prevailing state associated with each of the software components in the operating system. The software manager user interface permits the computer user to view the information that is stored in the configuration database, and specify any changes the user might wish to make in the prevailing system configuration. The software manager server communicates with both the user interface and the configuration

database, to carry out any user-specified changes and update the configuration database to reflect those changes. (*See* col. 2, lines 22-60).

In contrast, applicants' claimed system allows users to specify the setup action to be performed on each component/sub-component (*e.g.*, install, uninstall, add, recovery, no action, *etc.*). Version information and disk space requirements are also displayed on the page. As users select and deselect the components or modify install actions on a component, full dependency checking is performed. Additionally, the UI also displays a coloring difference between components that are in the process of installing or are already installed versus the components that are set to install but are not installed to further distinguish these different states. (*See* pg. 17, paragraph [0061]-pg. 18, paragraph [0063]).

Hendrickson *et al.* does not disclose a UI that displays version information and disk space requirements for the installation of each component, or a coloring difference between components that are installed and components that are not installed. Hendrickson *et al.* merely discloses a software manager user interface that presents the system files in logical groupings, presents the user with a listing of items of the given type, and permits the user to execute various operations. The user can also request information regarding a particular item. (*See* col. 8, line 50-col. 9, line 20). Accordingly, Hendrickson *et al.* is silent with regard to a method for displaying on a display device a component install action selection screen for an installation application, …, comprising:…; ***displaying version information and disk space requirements for each of the plurality of constituent components; and displaying a coloring difference between a plurality of constituent components that are in the process of installing or are already installed versus a plurality of constituent components that are set to install but are not installed***.

Cheng, Jr. *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Hendrickson *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 5 (which claims 2-4 respectively depend there from). Cheng, Jr. *et al.* relates to a system and method that automatically updates software components from numerous diverse software vendors on the computer systems of a plurality of end users. The system includes at least one database that stores software update information for a plurality of software products manufactured by diverse software vendors. The database is maintained by a service provider on a service provider computer system. The software update information specifies the update program or files and their network location on the computer

system of the software vendors, which computer systems are connected over the network to the service provider computer system and stores information that describes an installation process for installing the software update on a user's computer. (*See* pg. 2, paragraphs [0012]-[0013]).

The Examiner relies on Cheng, Jr. *et al.* to provide a listing of "available install actions" for the listing of related features shown in Hendrickson *et al.* (*See* Office Action dated 6-21-07, pg. 4). Thus, Cheng, Jr. *et al.* does not disclose a UI that displays version information and disk space requirements for the installation of each component, or a coloring difference between components that are installed and components that are not installed. Cheng, Jr. *et al.* merely discloses a system that automatically updates software components from numerous diverse software vendors on the computer systems of a plurality of end users. Accordingly, Cheng, Jr. *et al.* is also silent with regard to a method for displaying on a display device a component install action selection screen for an installation application, ..., comprising:...; ***displaying version information and disk space requirements for each of the plurality of constituent components; and displaying a coloring difference between a plurality of constituent components that are in the process of installing or are already installed versus a plurality of constituent components that are set to install but are not installed.***

In view of the aforementioned deficiencies of the cited art, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn with respect to independent claims 1 and 5 (and claims 2-4 which depend respectively there from).

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP1152USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Marisa J. Zink/
Marisa J. Zink
Reg. No. 48,064

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731